British Nationalist

FOR RACE AND NATION

MARCH 1987

12p

The SDP 'phenomenon'

NEW COLOURS — SAME OLD GANG

THE LANDSLIDE VICTORY of Mrs. Rosie Barnes, the SDP candidate, in the recent Greenwich by-election was the product of a gigantic spoof now being pulled over the British electorate by politicians and mass media. The purpose of the spoof is to convince the electorate that the SDP/Liberal Alliance represents some kind of 'new force' in British politics and, as such, provides a genuine 'alternative' to the present discredited Tory Government.

In fact the Alliance is no new force at all, merely the emergence of a new grouping, and under new colours, of old gang politicians and old gang policies that have all been put to the test in the past and have all miserably **failed**.

And, as for being an 'alternative' to the Tories, the Alliance is on all the really essential issues of the same mind as the present Government. Only over the most trivial details do the two differ.

Tories and the Alliance put up a show of 'argument' over the raging issue of unemployment. When we penetrate behind all this we find that the two are both faithful supporters of the international economic system that has resulted in nearly 3½ million people being without jobs in Britain due to uncontrolled imports of manufactured goods.

Likewise, the two are both supporters of British membership of the European Common Market, which is part of this same international system and whose rules forbid us taking measures to stop these imports.

Both the Alliance and the Tories support continued immigration and are against any scheme to repatriate Britain's ethnic minorities. They are both opposed to the restoration of capital punishment, although some Tories individually support that restoration. They are both soft on law and order, although Tories sometimes make a pretence of being otherwise. Recent disclosures in court have shown that the appalling Tottenham riot of October 11985, which resulted in the killing of PC Keith Blakelock by a crazed, mainly black mob, was the product of irresolution and weakness by police chiefs in the early stages of the riot, this being in accordance with policing policies recommended in the fatuous Scarman Report — commissioned by the present **Tory Government** and supported by the **Alliance**.

Both Tories and the Alliance are raising the alarm about the AIDS disease, but neither will agree to one of the first essentials in combatting AIDS, which is the restoration of the law forbidding homosexuality. Likewise, both Tories and the Alliance are against the return of the law forbidding abortion. Both in fact are champions of the 'permissive society'.

DR. OWEN
No new leader but just another failed Labour politician of yesterday

Both Tories and the Alliance support the infamous 'Anglo-Irish Agreement' under which the government of a foreign state (Eire) is given a say in the affairs of a part of the United Kingdom (Northern Ireland).

Both Tories and the Alliance are in favour of the continuation of overseas aid, now running at £1,300 million a year, to the Third World, while many folk languish in need here in this country, notably the elderly who have suffered much from the cold during the recent winter.

And supposing that anyone should imagine that Labour differs from the Tories or Alliance over any of these issues, let us remind everyone that over all of them **Labour supports basically the same policies!**

What this means is that the so-called 'alternatives' now being offered to the British people at election times are just sham alternatives; where the essential issues are involved, **no alternative exists!**

THE S.D.P. TOP BRASS

And what of the leaders of the SDP, the party that won at Greenwich? Are they new people? Again, no! They are merely a rag-bag of drop-outs from the Labour Party. The head of the SDP, David Owen, was a disastrous Foreign Secretary in the disastrous Labour Government of 1974-79. Mrs. Shirley Williams was a disastrous Minister of Education in the same government. Roy Jenkins was a disastrous Chancellor of the Exchequer in that government.

The SDP of today is in fact only the failed Labour Party of yesterday, sailing under a new flag.

A big red herring was introduced into the election at Greenwich. The mass media persuaded the voters to elect the SDP candidate because of fear that, if they did not, Labour would win and a 'hard-line' left-winger would get into parliament.

In fact, whether the Labour candidate, Mrs. Dierdre Wood, got in at Greenwich would have been completely irrelevant — there would have been **no change** in British politics in the things that really mattered.

The electors of Greenwich were fooled into voting for what they thought was an 'alternative' to the Tories and Labour but in fact what they voted for was a continuation of things exactly as they are!

So what real chance of change is there on offer to the British people — a change from the policies, leaders and political institutions that have been failing Britain ever since the end of World War II, indeed for most of the present century? There is only one chance: it lies along the road of **nationalism.**

This means a complete rejection of **all** the established parties and their racket of a system. It means a preparedness to support new men and new policies that are radically different from those offered by the system. It means turning to those at present on the

Contd. on page 3



NO CHANGE
Rosie Barnes, winner at Greenwich, gives her victory wave. In fact she represents no new force in politics, only a realignment of the old forces have failed again and again

THE ONLY ALTERNATIVE

Who offers real change? This small chart shows how on the really major issues of concern to the British people today the established parties do not differ at all. On those issues the people can only bring about a proper change of direction by turning to British Nationalism.

The REAL issues	Tories Labour SDP/Liberal Alliance	BNP
UNEMPLOYMENT	Maintain the international economic system which lays Britain open to a flood of manufactured imports, taking away British jobs.	Adopt a policy of economic nationalism. Protect British manufacturing industry against imports
THE COMMON MARKET	Keep Britain in	Bring Britain out
IMMIGRATION	Let it continue	Stop it. Organise repatriation of ethnic minorities
OVERSEAS AID	Let it continue	Stop it. Divert the money to helping the needy in Britain
CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	Do not restore it	Bring it back
A.I.D.S. AND PUBLIC HEALTH	Keep homosexuality legal	Make it illegal

British
Nationalist

No. 65 MARCH 1987
Editor: John Morse

WHY NOT KEEP LEYLAND BRITISH?

WHATEVER WAY the merger between Leyland trucks division and the Dutch company DAF is presented, it amounts in effect to a sell-out of yet another British manufacturing concern to foreign ownership. DAF will have 60 per-cent of the shares in the new company, which means that it will have control.

This move has been presented as the only economically sensible one. In fact it makes no economic sense at all.

The government tells us that Leyland trucks has been costing the taxpayer £1½ million a week and that this has got to stop.

But the effect of the merger with DAF will be to create approximately 22,000 redundancies, if not more.

If we consider what this is likely to cost the nation in payment of dole and social security, we will find that the saving the government talks about will be virtually cancelled out.

And it all means just one more slice of British industry whose fate will be determined by decisions made in boardrooms abroad.

So was there an alternative to the merger of Leyland with DAF? Yes there was.

A policy of protection of the British market for motor vehicles as for other manufactured goods could have been introduced, with the result that imports would be kept out and a huge new field of sales could have been opened up for Leyland, as well as other British manufacturers.

Leyland could then have achieved, by degrees, the volume of output necessary to make the firm viable — and without the need for one single redundancy.

And by the same policy we could regenerate the whole of British manufacturing industry, creating jobs for the near 3½ million now sitting idle.

That is what could be achieved by a NATIONAL policy, geared to a NATIONAL economic and trading system.

Instead, the government prefers INTERNATIONAL policies, geared to an INTERNATIONAL system.

The system that has made Britain an industrial desert and a land without hope for millions wanting to work.

One day these disastrous policies must be reversed, with British industry restored to British control and given a monopoly of the British market.

That is the only way to industrial recovery, full employment and national freedom and self-respect.

PRIVATE RADIO: WHO WILL BE IN CONTROL?

THE GOVERNMENT is now talking about giving encouragement to the setting up of more private and 'independent' radio stations around the country. The claim is that this will lead to more diversity and freedom of political viewpoints expressed.

This is in fact a dangerous illusion.

Private radio stations, like all other private broadcasting, will depend on advertising revenue. The broadcasters will not be politically 'independent' at all, but at all times will have to make sure they do not broadcast views that will upset their advertisers.

And, as we know, there are certain interests that will not hesitate to use the threat of cancellation of advertising against those who displease them!

Why we must not desert Ulster

ACCORDING TO A REPORT in The Daily Express of February 10th, no less than 61 per-cent of people questioned in a recent opinion poll thought that Britain should pull troops out of Northern Ireland, either immediately or within a preset period. Only 29 per-cent said that Northern Ireland should remain in the United Kingdom. And Ian Paisley was regarded by more people as a force for 'evil' in Northern Ireland than was Sinn Fein leader and IRA supporter Gerry Adams.

No doubt the purpose of the *Express* publishing these findings was to downgrade Ulster in the eyes of the public and to bang a drum for British disengagement from the province. In fact all the report and findings did (assuming they are genuine) was illustrate the appalling state of public ignorance of the issues really at stake in Ulster.

And as well as ignorance there is apparently a great deal of apathy. Only 3 per-cent of those questioned gave the Ulster issue any degree of importance.

The ignorance of the issue was underlined by the fact that 45 per-cent believed religion to be at the root of Ulster's problems, whereas the truth of the matter is that the problems are essentially political.

Ian Paisley was clearly the most hated figure on the Ulster scene. 70 per-cent thought him a force for evil in Ulster politics while only 55 per-cent thought the same of Gerry Adams, despite Mr. Paisley's consistent condemnation of terrorism and Adams' equally consistent endorsement of it.

Ex-Irish Republic Premier Garret Fitzgerald; on the other hand, was seen by 39 per-cent as a force for good — notwithstanding his continual efforts to meddle in Ulster's affairs.

MISINFORMATION

We should be alarmed at this distorted picture of the Northern Irish situation, but we should hardly be surprised.

For years now, mainland politicians and journalists in the mass media have kept up a continual barrage of lies and misinformation about what is really happening in Northern Ireland, what the issues are and what is the 'commonsense' solution.

Deeper down even than this, there is a state of abysmal ignorance among the public, conditioned by misleading tendencies in education, which paint a picture of Northern Ireland as some strange 'foreign' country with which Britain ought to have nothing to do, rather than a loyal and valued member of the Kingdom.

It must be a major purpose of the British Nationalist movement to counter this ignorance and distortion, even if it is not immediately politically expedient to do so.

First, we must inform the public of the magnificent contribution of Northern Irishmen (as well as loyal Irishmen from the South) to Britain's efforts in the two major world wars of this century. Likewise we must lay stress on the contribution of people of the same stock to the building of the British Empire and the opening up of once untamed areas of the world to the influence of British civilisation.

We must point out also that today, despite the instability in the province caused by the men of terror there, the academic level in Ulster schools is higher than anywhere else in the UK — an indication, not only of sound teaching methods, but also of a high genetic level of intelligence and natural ability.

We must also — whether it is at the moment popular or not — defend the role in Ulster of Mr. Ian Paisley. That Paisley should be even coupled with garbage like Adams, let alone thought worse than him, is an appalling injustice. Paisley is a British patriot, whose only 'crime' is his dedication to the maintenance of Northern Ireland's British identity and tradition. He is not, contrary to popular myth, a religious bigot who wishes to harm individual Catholics, though he has — quite rightly — publicly opposed the role of the Catholic Church and priesthood in destabilising the situation in Ulster and giving aid and comfort to the gunmen and bombers of the IRA.

EXCLUSIVE: Poll verdict on the troubled province

Pull our troops out of Ulster say 61%

NEARLY two thirds of people living in mainland Britain would like to see British troops pulled out of Northern Ireland, an exclusive Daily Express-MORI poll reveals today.



PRODUCT OF PROPAGANDA AND IGNORANCE
Headline of Daily Express report on February 10th

SUPPORT LOYALISTS

Along with supporting Paisley, we should also support the broader loyalist community in Ulster that is opposed to the infamous Anglo-Irish Agreement, for what is that agreement but the first step to a sell-out of Northern Ireland to the Irish Republic?

Mrs. Thatcher has assured us that the Agreement does not mean this and that Northern Ireland will remain a part of the United Kingdom as long as the majority there wish it so. To that we can only reply that, in that case, what business has the Republic in the affairs of Northern Ireland and what business has a so-called 'British' government allowing it to be involved in such affairs?

The public on the mainland has been brainwashed into regarding the loyalists who oppose a sell-out to the South as 'extremists' and 'fanatics'. But to illustrate their position let us consider a hypothesis.

Let us imagine that the counties of Kent and Sussex were under the threat of annexation by France and that the French Government included in its country's constitution a clause claiming that Kent and Sussex were 'French'.

Then, as part of this, let us imagine that our own British government was prepared to listen to the French claims on Kent and Sussex and draw up an agreement with Paris that granted the French the right to participation in the two counties' affairs, including their providing judges to sit in in the counties' courts and the right of French policemen to be consulted concerning the counties' internal security.

Would we then think ill of Kent and Sussex people who were militantly opposed to these developments, who were determined to remain British and were prepared, if necessary, to take up arms to defend their British nationality and heritage?

ULSTER'S ONLY CRIME

We believe that those apathetic folk who sit in their cosy cottages and bungalows on the Kent and Sussex coasts and pontificate against those militants in Ulster whose only crime is to want to remain British should try to picture themselves in the situation just described. What would they do in such a situation? Would they not fight to prevent themselves being annexed by France?

In all essentials, this is precisely the situation that British subjects find themselves tied up in in Ulster. They are **our people, our fellow countrymen.** They want to remain so. Is that a crime?

Or is not the real crime that of our government, which seems prepared to sell them out to a foreign country on an instalment plan? Does not such a government, and all the other politicians supporting it in that endeavour, rightly deserve the description of **treasonable**? In our book it certainly does.

Ulster has stood by Britain through thick and thin over the long course of our nation's history — spilling the blood of its finest sons on the world's battlefields in Britain's cause.

Now is the time for Britain to stand by Ulster. If it does not, it will deserve to go down with Ulster. And, bearing in mind that the forces out to destroy our kinsmen the other side of the Irish Sea are equally bent on destroying us on the mainland, if we do not fight by Ulster's side, this is assuredly what will happen.

WHO IS EVIL? Majority says Paisley (left)

PAISLEY 70%

ADAMS 55%

RONALD RICKCORD
Talking Points

NO-GO AREAS

EVERY RIGHT-MINDED PERSON will welcome the acquittal of Police Inspector Douglas Lovelock, who accidentally shot Mrs. Cherry Groce during the operation to find her trigger-happy son, Michael. In all fairness, little blame can be attached to the police for Mrs. Groce's injuries. The responsibility for what occurred lies primarily with the politicians who, by their soft attitude towards crime and criminals, have placed the police in an invidious position. The highly irresponsible action of the Lambeth Council, which was reluctant to assist the police, hardly helped matters. If only the politicians would concern themselves with GOVERNING instead of the winning of votes, legislation to bring such councils as Lambeth to heel would have been enacted long ago.

Another disturbing thing to emerge from Inspector Lovelock's ordeal was the revelation that the police were unable to mount proper surveillance on Mrs. Groce's house, or to use enough armed policemen to avoid the need to make a forced entry, because of the "sensitive nature of the area." From this it would appear that, despite all the denials by people like Metropolitan Police Commissioner Sir Kenneth Newman, there are places where the duty of the police to maintain law and order can no longer be exercised. In other words, no-go areas DO exist.

SPIES GALORE

IF THE SECURITY of our country were not so serious a matter, Dr. David Owen's suggestion that in future a committee of both Houses of Parliament should monitor the intelligence services would be laughable. Can Dr. Owen tell us why we should regard MPs, Lords or even — dare I say it? — Prime Ministers as any more patriotic than carpenters or chambermaids? After all, according to Mr. Chapman Pincher in his book 'Their Trade is Treachery', the former Director General of MI5, Sir Martin Furnival-Jones, told the Franks Committee in 1971 that 101 MPs "were known to be in contact with Russians or other Iron Curtain nationals known to be Soviet Bloc intelligence officers. This figure was withheld from the published report of the Committee..."

Mr. Pincher also states in his book that he believes the figure has substantially increased since 1971. He goes on to tell us that the Socialist MP Tom Driberg, besides being a rampant homosexual habituee of public toilets, was also a member of the KGB! This disgusting specimen of humanity was, shortly before his death, awarded a peerage by Harold Wilson! Driberg was not alone in owing his allegiance to Britain's enemies; there are many more who are still getting away with it, but, as Mr. Pincher says in his book: "I am unable to name others who are still alive and shelter behind the libel laws, as it is difficult to induce any intelligence source to appear as a witness, as MI5 itself knows only too well." MPs are also protected by a ruling made by Mr. Wilson in 1964 which gives them immunity from investigation by MI5 without the specific permission of the Prime Minister. They are also immune from telephone-tapping. The Augean stables we call Parliament certainly need cleansing!

A PATRIOT

WHILE ON THE SUBJECT of the MI5 spy-book case, it seems quite unfair to me that the author of the book in question, Mr. Peter Wright, should be denigrated as a traitor by the government for revealing the treasonable activities that have been going on for so long in high places. Surely it is the duty of all loyal Britons to expose any person, however exalted, who betrays our country. In the immortal words of William Cobbett, "May that man perish for ever and ever who, having the power, neglects to bring to justice the perjured, the suborning, the insolent miscreants, who openly sell their country and their own souls." Peter Wright tried to bring such people to justice, but was repeatedly foiled by his superiors. May he now succeed in his one-man campaign to see that justice is done.

CENSORSHIP

THE ROYAL COURT THEATRE'S action in cancelling Jim Allen's play 'Perdition' because it offended the Board of Deputies of British Jews by alleging that some Jews participated in the 'Holocaust' atrocities provides yet another example of how freedom of speech is being eroded in our country. This latter-day version of book-burning is not made any more palatable by the fact that those responsible for it are, for the most part, people of alien origin who have been permitted to settle here.

One of the arguments used to justify the ban is that the play is "historically inaccurate". So too are a great may books and plays, including 'The Monocled Mutineer', an absolute travesty of the truth that was screened on TV a few months ago, and 'The Diary of Anne Frank', which is currently being serialised by BBC TV. We all know that the 'Diary' was written with a ballpoint pem, a writing implement not invented until the war had ended. Very few people go to the Royal Court Theatre, but millions watch TV; so is it not all the more incumbent on the BBC to present historical matters truthfully?

So why does the BBC insist on putting on programmes which present such distorted and dishonest versions of history? And what on earth is it doing allowing a creature like Duncan Campbell, who has previously been convicted for offences against the Official Secrets Act, to assist in the production of programmes about defence? Furthermore, I would like to know why the BBC cancelled the production of Ian Curteis's pro-British play about the Falklands War? We may well wonder what sort of people have gained control of our broadcasting in recent years.

QUOTE

"It is easier to make money out of lies than by truth. Truth has only one power: it can kindle souls. But, after all, a soul is a greater force than a crowd."

G. Lowes Dickinson

Britain's defence: time for new thinking

N.A.T.O. FORCES FACING EAST: ARE THEY IN MAGINOT LINE SITUATION?

TODAY'S TOMMY
Should he not be guarding Britain instead of NATO?

IN A PARTY POLITICAL BROADCAST by the Tories last month the chosen theme was that of defence, and the attempt was made to persuade the viewers that a Conservative government, and only a Conservative government, can be relied upon to see to it that Britain is properly defended.

The broadcast conveniently omitted the fact that under the present government there have recently been big cuts in defence spending that have alarmed the chiefs of all the main services, but we will pass over that matter here.

What we want to look at here is the whole question of what our forces should be defending, and against whom, and what, they should be defending it.

The Tory broadcast laid great stress on the build-up of Soviet forces in Eastern Europe and clearly expected the viewer to agree with the assumption that it is these forces which constitute the big threat to us and that our defence policy should therefore be concentrated on the need to defend us (and our presumed allies) against this threat.

So of course the broadcast championed NATO, with its American control and command, as the institution we should all be supporting if we valued our security.

Our main efforts of defence, therefore, should be to strengthen Britain's contribution to the forces of NATO.

But are the Soviet Union and Warsaw Pact forces the main threat to our security? Are they in fact a realistic threat to our security at all?

For the near 42 years since the end of World War II conventional wisdom on defence has had it that Russia's ambition is to march westward and subjugate the whole of Europe and that Europe's only defence against this threat is to merge military forces under an international system with America in charge. As part of this, it is stressed that Europe (including Britain) would fall to the Soviets were it not for the American shield.

PERMANENT OCCUPATION?

But have we ever stopped to think about the implications for Russia herself of staging a military attack on the West and then subsequently having to maintain a permanent occupation of the West?

For a start, just what purpose would Russia have in invading the West? What Russian interest would be served by her doing so?

To ask these questions is not to suggest that Soviet Russia is our friend; most decidedly she is not. It is merely to suggest that, accepting that Soviet Russia's interests are not our interests and that she is not involved in global politics for our good health, she has no interest of her own in attacking us.

Soviet Russia right now is finding it an extremely heavy burden occupying Afghanistan, on top of her longer-standing burden of occupying Eastern Europe — so much so that there are signs that Mr. Gorbachev is seeking an early withdrawal from Afghanistan.

So can you imagine the kind of burden that the Soviets would have if they had to occupy, police and then defend for their own system the following countries:-

West Germany, France, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Austria, Switzerland, Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, the United Kingdom and Eire.

Soviet resources would be so stretched to the limit that there would be nothing left for the Russian people!

In addition to this, and in fact because of this, such an occupation would be highly unpopular in Russia and would place the position of the Soviet government in grave danger of overthrow.

Do Mr. Gorbachev and his colleagues really want this?

And all this is supposing that the Soviets COULD successfully march against Western Europe and occupy it in the first place.

In World War II one European country ALONE, Germany, nearly defeated Soviet Russia — would have done in fact had Russia not had massive help from the US and Britain in the way of war supplies.

Are we to believe then that Western Germany (which in population means most of Germany), France, Britain and all the others could not stop a Soviet invasion across the Iron Curtain — even without the help of America?

Indeed if we could not we must have got to the point where we are past saving!

SOVIET FORCES ON WINTER MANOEUVRES
Was there ever any intention to march them West?

RUSSIA KNOWS TRUTH

The truth is of course that Russia knows she could not defeat the Western European nations in a war, that she could not subsequently police Western Europe even if she did, and that she has never had the slightest intention of making such an attack on us.

Indeed why should the Kremlin, when it is doing so well furthering its own policy and interests throughout the world by 'peaceful' methods, risk spoiling all that has been gained by a suicide attack on us that would get her nowehere?

She has had the sense not to make such an attack for the last 42 years, and she most certainly will not be daft enough to make any such attack in the future.

Communism is the enemy of this country, certainly. And there is no party that is more resolute in its opposition to communism than our own party, the BNP.

But we believe that it is sensible to understand HOW and BY WHAT ROUTE communism intends to attack and undermine us. It is by the POLITICAL method and route, not any other — save of course economic warfare.

It completely excludes any policy of military attack.

If we understand this, what then are the implications for national defence?

Essentially, that putting our main defence eggs into the basket of the NATO system, designed to stop an attack by Russia that will never come, we are barking entirely up the wrong tree.

We are in fact like those who erected the French Maginot Line in anticipation of an attack by German forces across the German/French border which in the event never came.

BRITAIN'S DEFENCE MUST BE NATIONAL

We believe that, with these considerations in mind, Britain's defence should no longer be centred on NATO. Instead it should become essentially a NATIONAL defence system, geared to the protection of the United Kingdom and its own NATIONAL interests around the world.

It should be free of American or any other foreign control, and able to be put into action to serve the BRITISH interest wherever and whenever required.

It should be equipped by weapons supplied from British factories, not weapons for the supply of which we depend on foreigners.

And, as part of this, American forces should be withdrawn from British soil.

Of course, if ever Britain and her neighbours in Western Europe were ever attacked by a common enemy we would fight together to defend ourselves against that enemy — that goes without saying.

But this is very different from making the assumption that Soviet Russia is the only conceivable such enemy and that all our strategy of defence should revolve around being ready to withstand an attack by her.

This paper is not for weakening Britain's defences; on the contrary, we want to see them much stronger and we urge that government give a much higher priority to defence spending than the present Tory government is doing.

But we believe that our defences should be organised for the purpose of OUR OWN security, under our own command and capable of being equipped from our own industries.

The French have a defence policy conceived along similar lines. That is why France is not a member of NATO and foreign forces are not on French soil.

If France can do this, so can we. We are not, basically, a weaker nation than France.

It is time that British politicians and service chiefs woke up to these realities and stopped being bogged down in military thinking that is long out of date — if indeed it was ever justified at all!

YOUR LETTERS

Sir, — The achievement of the British National Party at Greenwich in topping the National Front vote by 116 to 103 may not prove very much from the BNP's point of view, but it does at least help to knock on the head the claim of some people in the Front that their party name is a special asset that could not be sacrificed in any merger of nationalists.

This apart, the main thing that the Greenwich result underlined is the utter futility of two separate and competing nationalist organisations vying with one another for the same vote. This must certainly stop if the nationalist cause is eventually to win.

T. BARBER (Miss)
London S.E.19

Sir, — Your front page item of last month 'Time curb the BBC' came not a moment too soon. I rate this institution as being a bigger factor in Britain's national decline than any of the parties that have governed us for the past 40 years — and that is saying something!

It is said sometimes that a people gets the government it deserves. That may well be true, but the outlook of a people, and the thoughts and sentiments that induce them to vote for one type of government or another, are the product of their daily diet of news and views. Television has now overtaken the newspapers as the main source of the news and views that prevail in this country today. It has done more than anything to mould the present national outlook, and the outlook it has moulded is one of mass silliness, apathy and racial self-guilt — all of which combine to make us tolerant of politicians whom a sturdier race of people, with a sense of national self-respect, would have thrown out a long time ago.

D.S. FORD
Portland, Dorset

Sir, — Concerning AIDS, it seems that the media is purposefully playing down the importance of the origin of this menace: Africa. Health organisations estimate that some 3 million people in the African Continent died from AIDS-related illnesses. Meanwhile immigration into Britain from Africa continues at a high rate.

D. AUSTEN
London E.6

Sir, — Your revelation of 'armoured cars' planned for milkmen was frightening. This is the land the politicians have handed down to us!

P. LISTER
Aberdeen

Tamil 'refugee' flood

HOW WHITE WEAKNESS IS BEING EXPLOITED

THE CURRENT ATTEMPT by a group of phoney Tamil 'refugees' to gain entry into Britain by flying into Heathrow Airport without travel documents or passports and then staging a strip protest, demanding their so-called 'rights' when refused admittance, illustrates one thing above all. It shows how Western countries such as our own have come to be regarded as a soft touch by 'Third World' freeloaders.

The current global movement of Tamils in the direction of the West is by no means the first wave of this type of 'Third World' immigration in which Britain has been caught up. First there were the Ugandan Asians admitted to this country by the Heath government in 1972. Then, within 6 months of becoming premier in 1979, after conning the electorate with talk of immigration 'controls', Mrs. Thatcher let the 'Boat People' in.

With these precedents, claims of 'refugee' status have become a standard pretext for continuing coloured immigration. The British and other white nations are being brainwashed with propaganda to enfeeble their will to resist this coloured tide.

It is now the turn of the Tamils of Sri Lanka to latch onto what they see as the weakness of the Whites. Backed up by hard luck stories about their alleged 'persecution' in Sri Lanka, the Tamil influx in to the West in recent years has been a highly planned and organised operation, as current news reports make plain.

Tamils are said to be anxious to escape their present homeland not just for reasons of 'persecution' but because many of them consider it 'smart'. They do not leave Sri Lanka in order to return to India, the land from which their race originates; they do so in order to get to western countries, such as Britain, Canada or the United States.

One report states outright that the Tamils believe they can exploit both western laws and "most of all, tender western consciences" to gain entry to white countries.

A well organised system of transportation, together with false papers and cleverly prepared and rehearsed cover stories is said to have been set up to move the Tamils West. Trips to western lands are co-ordinated in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

The technique is always the same, having been employed in one white country after another. The Tamils illegally enter a western country, establish a foothold there long enough to get an enquiry going into their refugee status, and entice support from local media and politicians, relying on the climate of misplaced sentimental liberal humanitarian weakness prevailing in the West to work in their favour.

Now this trick is being used against Britain, where, following their well publicised Heathrow protest, a stay of deportation was rapidly obtained for the Tamils via the courts by pro-immigrant organiations. The Tamils' cases are now to be individually reviewed — a procedure which could take a considerable length of time.

This violates all common sense; were Britain governed on sane principles by rulers who made her own national interest paramount, all illegal immigrants would be instantly removed, and without any ceremony, from the country whose laws they had contravened. At the same time, 'refugee' status, even if genuine, would not qualify Third-Worlders for any 'rights' or give them claims against the British nation — let alone a right or claim to residence in Britain, with welfare and housing benefits, at the British taxpayer's expense, thrown in for good measure.

It is time for us to abandon this sloppy sentimentality. The British people must stop viewing vital issues bearing on their own survival through the eyes of other races, and always worrying about the welfare of the rest of the world — whose problems are in any case beyond our power to solve. It is time to put Britain and the British people first.

STRIPTEASE ACT
Tamils' demo at London Airport

NEW COLOURS — SAME OLD GANG

(Contd. from front page)

'fringe' of politics, who have no immediate chance of political power because they are not strong enough, but who could **in time** become strong enough to win that power with the help of a great tide of support from the British people, voting at long last for the policies in which they believe rather than merely for the least evil among the front runners in current contention for office at Westminster.

For there is **no other way** out of the current morass of a bankrupt economy, an anarchic society being torn apart by race riots and soaring crime, and a political system that divides the nation over sham issues while its enemies within work to destroy it, a system which elevates to power, year in and year out, the least fit and the last able.

The British people must take this alternative road and they must take it soon. For if they delay very much longer our nation will be ruined beyond repair.

AFTER GREENWICH

The future belongs to us!

THE COMBINED VOTE given to the two nationalist candidates standing in the recent Greenwich by-election was 219 (or 0.63 per-cent of the poll). Nothing to shout about, but not all that surprising in the circumstances.

The mass media had done their job well, creating a panic landslide vote for the SDP candidate by playing on the fears of a Labour victory resulting in the election of 'hard-left' contender Dierdre Wood. After ramming home how 'dangerous' it would be if Mrs. Wood were elected, the media then got to work persuading everyone that the SDP candidate had by far the best chance of beating her and that therefore everyone opposed to a Labour victory should vote SDP, regardless of their actual preferences. This had a big effect on the Tory poll, as can be seen by the derisory figure of 3,852 votes given to the Tory candidate John Antcliffe; undoubtedly many Tory voters, feeling that their man could not win, switched to the SDP so as to keep Labour out.

And if this happened to the Tories, it is reasonable to believe that it also happened to the two nationalist candidates. Ian Dell of the British National Party, and Joe Pearce of the National Front both lost out in the anti-Labour panic; people who would have preferred to vote BNP or NF instead voted SDP, knowing that neither nationalists could win.

Of course the fact that the nationalist vote was split two ways did not help. This was highly regrettable and should have been avoided.

In the past the BNP has left the field free for the Front in by-elections where the latter party has been the first to choose to fight and where it has a local organisation better able to contest an election than the BNP. On this occasion the reverse was the case: the BNP announced its candidature first, aware that it had a better organisation in Greenwich than the NF.

Shortly after the BNP candidature had been announced, a meeting took place between Mr. Martin Wingfield, a senior official of the National Front, and BNP Elections Officer Michael Easter. At this meeting Wingfield gave an undertaking that the NF would not fight and that, furthermore, some of its activists would come over and help with the BNP campaign. This sensible attitude was welcomed by the BNP.

N.F. CHALLENGES B.N.P.

Only a day or so later, however, the NF did a complete about-turn and announced that it would put up its own candidate in Greenwich as a rival to the BNP. The candidate selected was Joe Pearce, a national official of the Front and a much better known public figure than Ian Dell of the BNP. Whereas Dell was chosen because he was down to be his party's candidate at the next general election and was a local man, Pearce was drafted in from the outside, having no personal connections with Greenwich.

It seems difficult to read any purpose into the decision of the NF to fight Greenwich other than the desire to 'spike' the BNP, and this seemed confirmed when Mr. Ian Anderson of the National Front was heard to predict gleefully in front of BNP members: "We'll take you to the cleaners at Greenwich!"

Many thought that the Front would have the edge over the BNP in the election. Apart from the fact that its name is still better known to the public and its candidate better known also, it probably has a slight advantage in numerical strength of active members over London and the South East as a whole, though not actually in Greenwich. Also, its candidate, though of similar age to Ian Dell, is much more experienced than the latter as speaker and propagandist. Many NF supporters thought that their party, by drafting in one of its 'heavyweights', would score over the BNP.

In the event, it failed to do so — despite Mr. Anderson's confident forecast. Final figures were: Joe Pearce (NF) 103 votes; Ian Dell (BNP) 116 votes. The BNP won the conest, although it would have preferred there to be no contest.

For a while now this paper has been proclaiming that the future of British Nationalism belongs to the British National Party. In the general election of 1983 the Front scored higher votes and crowed loudly that this showed its superior support potential. We replied that it was then 'early days'. The BNP had only been going just over a year and was handicapped by a name of much lesser renown, which would take some time to get established. Also the BNP spread its campaign resources so thinly across the ground in that election that it could affor a back-up election address for its candidates in only 5 seats.

Time has moved on since then and the BNP is now a party with better organisation and resources. At Greenwich it put an election address out to every household in the constituency as well as many leaflets and posters, and despite both its party and candidate's name being less well known it scored slightly higher than the Front.

No doubt had the two parties fought as one they could have done much better. With more manpower and money and a better rationalisation of campaign resources, nationalists could have put up a fight which would have made much more impact, with the result of a vote probably higher than that of Dell and Pearce combined. The 'Keep Labour Out' campaign undoubtedly would have limited the chances of a good nationalist vote even in these circumstances, but it ought to have been more respectable had it not been split by the foolish intervention of the NF.

Let us hope that by the time the next general election comes — and with the poor Tory showing at Greenwich Mrs. Thatcher may now choose to call it later rather than sooner — sensible councils will prevail and the whole weight of the nationalist movement will be put behind the party with the best potential to win support for nationalism.

We are noe more convinced than ever that that party is the BNP.

Thanks are due to all those BNP party workers who put in long hours in the Greenwich campaign, especially to candidate Ian Dell, local organiser and election agent Terry Fitzgerald, and Richard Edmonds who directed leafletting operations.



IAN DELL
Candidate

TERRY FITZGERALD
Agent



RICHARD EDMONDS
Directed leafletting

BNP Recordings

RALLY '82
Speeches from the BNP national rally in London on October 11th 1982, the theme of which was 'Unite and fight for Britain's future!'
Side 1: Includes speech by Charles Parker; **Side 2:** Speech by John Tyndall.

VOICES OF NATIONALISM
Side 1: Recordings of speeches from the Nationalist Unity rally in London on September 5th 1981. Hear John Tyndall, Kenneth McKilliam, Len Bearsford Walker and others. **Side 2:** Talk by John Tyndall on 'The coming British Revolution'.

TYNDALL SPEAKS I
Side 1: Talk on 'Our Anglo-Saxon heritage' (about the worldwide dispersal of the peoples of British stock); **Side 2:** Talk on 'Britain's economic crisis'.

TYNDALL SPEAKS II
Side 1: Talk on 'The case for nationalism' (the internationalist argument demolished); **Side 2:** Talk on 'Tragedy of the 20th century' (analysis of the results of the 2nd World War).

TYNDALL SPEAKS III
Side 1: Talk on 'Why we must repatriate' (theme self-exlanatory); **Side 2:** Talk on 'Foundations of the national community' (analysis of rights and duties in a racial nationalist state).

These 5 sets of recordings are presented in cassette form and are available at £3.50 each (with 20p postage) from: BNP Recordings, PO Box 446, London SE23 2LS.

SPEARHEAD

For an in-depth view of nationalist policies read *Spearhead*, a 20-page monthly magazine which supports the British National Party. Price 50p. Yearly subscription £8.00. 63p for sample copy to: *Spearhead*, PO Box 446, London SE23 2LS.

BUY *BRITISH NATIONALIST* IN BULK

British Nationalist retails at 12p from your local seller. Would bulk purchasers order *only* in the quantities listed below. Standing orders welcomed.

10 copies £1.20 + 37p post
25 copies £2.70 + £1.00 post
50 copies £4.80 + £1.90 post
100 copies £8.40 + £2.35 post
150 copies £12.00 + £2.55 post
200 copies £15.00 + £2.75 post
300 copies £21.00 + £2.95 post
400 copies £26.40 + £3.25 post
500 copies £32.00) Bulk rates
1,000 copies £62.00) by Roadline

Cheques/postal orders to *British Nationalist*, PO Box 446, London SE23 2LS. Please keep orders and enquiries concerning *British Nationalist* totally separate from other correspondence in order to avoid delay and confusion.

Get these books while you can!

Some of the books on sale from BNP Book Service will no longer be available from the 1st April, these dealing with racial topics in a way liable to render them illegal under the new legislation contained in the Public Order Act of 1986. You can still order them if you are quick about it by writing, with cash with order, to: BNP Book Service, PO Box 446, London SE23 2LS. We list some of the books below:-

THE CAMP OF THE SAINTS (Jean Raspail) £2.40 (£1). A sensational novel about the destruction of the white world by Asian immigrant invasion. 1973, 311pp.

DID SIX MILLION REALLY DIE? (Richard Harwood) 50p (13p). The fact-filled pamphlet that refutes the Holocaust legends and evoked Zionist frenzy. 28pp.

THE DISPOSSESSED MAJORITY (Wilmot Robertson) £7.50 (£1.90). This book has attracted worldwide attention, dealing as it does with racial problems in America — and not simply the black-white situation. 2nd edition 1981, 613pp.

VENTILATIONS (Wilmot Robertson) £4.50 (37p). The sequel to the same author's widely acclaimed *Dispossessed Majority*. Revised edition 1982, 113pp.

RACE AND REALITY (Carleton Putnam) £4.00 (43p). A companion volume and supplement to *Race and Reason*, showing how the truth about the race issue has been suppressed by interested parties. 1967 (rep. 1977), 192pp.

NATURE'S ETERNAL RELIGION (Ben Klassen) £6.70 (£1.00). A controversial and hard-hitting book outlining the author's ideal of a new religion based on the right to survival of the white race. The author in presenting his ideas on this matter makes it plain who represents the threat to white survival. 1973, 508pp.

THE WHITE MAN'S BIBLE (Ben Klassen) £6.70 (£1.00). A companion volume to the same author's *Nature's Eternal Religion* in which he expands his concept of Creativity as the future religion of the white race. 1981, 451pp.

EXPANDING CREATIVITY (Ben Klassen) £4.20 (55p). A selection of the best articles written by the author in his paper *Racial Loyalty*. 1985, 255pp.

BUILDING A WHITER AND BRIGHTER WORLD (Ben Klassen) £4.20 (56p). A follow-on from *Expanding Creativity*, containing a further selection of articles from later issues of *Racial Loyalty*. 1985, 270pp.

THE SIX MILLION RECONSIDERED (W. Grimstad) £2.50 (66p). Examines not only the 'Holocaust' but other topics involved in the Jewish Question, including the exploitation of the 'anti-semitic' smear. 1977, 170pp.

THE TURNER DIARIES (Andrew MacDonald) £1.50 (37p). A powerful novel describing the fight-back of the White Man in America. A futuristic fantasy that might not be so fantastic after all. 1980, 211pp.

RACE AND POLITICS (H.B. Isherwood) 30p (13p). Shows that a sense of racial identity is an essential element of nationhood. 1974, 36pp.

THE USES OF RELIGION (Prof. Revilo P. Oliver) £1.00 (13p). Examines the value of religion as a socially cohesive force. 1982, 36pp.

SUBSCRIBE!

In order to make sure of receiving *British Nationalist* regularly, why not take out a subscription? The rate is £3.45 for 12 issues for subscribers in the British Isles. For subscribers overseas the rate is £4.00 for 12 issues (surface mail). Please make cheques/POs payable to *British Nationalist* and send to PO Box 446, London SE23 2LS.

An additional charge of £5 is required on all foreign currency POs and cheques and an additional £1 on all foreign currency sent in banknotes.

Name.....

Address.....

.....

ADVERTISING THE B.N.P. SYMBOL

Party lapel badges: £1.25 (inc. p&p).
Key-rings with party logo: £1.75 (inc. p&p).
Party logo in cloth, 2.4in. in diameter for sewing on shoulder of anorak: £1.50 (inc. p&p).
please send cash with orders to: PO Box 457, London SE20 7QE.

Contact your local party unit

THE BRITISH NATIONAL PARTY is organised into active units extending over most of the areas of the United Kingdom. Below we give a list of local addresses of the main units:-

NORTH LONDON
PO Box 462, Greenwood Road, Hackney, London E8 4HH

WEST LONDON
PO Box 33, Greenford, Middx. UB6 8DS

SOUTH LONDON
PO Box 446, London SE23 2LS

Bromley
PO Box 457, London SE20 7QE

EAST KENT
73 Shirkoak Park, Woodchurch, Ashford

DEVON & CORNWALL
PO Box 75, Plymouth PL1 1SQ

EAST ANGLIA (NORTH)
A9 Johnson Place, Norwich NR2 2SA

EAST ANGLIA (SOUTH)
2 Albert Road, Framlingham, Suffolk

EAST MIDLANDS
PO Box 148, Leicester LE3 2YD

BIRMINGHAM
PO Box 771, Great Barr, Birmingham B44 9LZ

STOKE-ON-TRENT
PO Box 320, Tunstall, Stoke

LIVERPOOL
PO Box 116, Liverpool L69 1SH

MANCHESTER & SALFORD
PO Box 16, Salford M6 5EP

YORKSHIRE

Leeds & Bradford
PO Box BR10, Bramley, Leeds 13

Wakefield
PO Box 42, Wakefield

Hull
PO Box 58, Hull HU6 7HR

TYNE & WEAR
PO Box 8, South Shields NE33 1LP

SCOTLAND
PO Box 85, Glasgow G3 8UL

The BNP also has units in West Kent, Basingstoke (Hants), Gloucestershire, Hertfordshire, Bedford, Cambridge, Brierley Hill (West Midlands), Coventry, Burton-on-Trent, Bolton & Bury, Warrington, Halifax, Sheffield and Cardiff. If you want to make contact with any of these units, or start a new unit, please write to party head office at: PO Box 446, London SE23 2LS.

WHAT WE STAND FOR

- The return of leadership and statesmanship to British affairs.
- A government that will put British interests first.
- British withdrawal from the European Common Market.
- Closer links with the White Commonwealth.
- Protection of British industry by the selective exclusion of foreign manufactured goods from Britain.
- A sane financial system that will give to the people the purchasing power to buy the goods they produce.
- The revival of British farming.
- British ownership and control of British industry and resources.
- A clamp-down on social security spongers and the restoration of the incentive to work — with the proviso that work is locally available.
- An end to immigration and a start to repatriation.
- British support for the Whites in South Africa.
- An end to financial aid to corrupt Third World regimes.
- The strengthening of Britain's defences.
- Tougher treatment of criminals.
- The smashing of the IRA, the death penalty for terrorists and firm support for the Loyalist majority in Northern Ireland.
- Repealing of the laws permitting Abortion and Homosexuality and a general toughening up of legislation against the promotion of obscenity in the media.
- The elimination of Communism in Britain, in the mass media, in the factory and in the schoolroom.

WRITE TO US

To: British National Party, PO Box 446, London SE23 2LS.
(Tick appropriate box)

Please send me more information, for which I enclose 25p ☐

I wish to become a full member and enclose £6 (Half-rate for OAPs and students) ☐

I wish to become an associate member and enclose £3 (no half-rate) ☐

Name.....

Address.....

.....

Printed and published by BN Press, London SE23 2LS